



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/882,985	06/15/2001	Michael J. Morton	MICR0207	9825

27792 7590 08/05/2005

MICROSOFT CORPORATION  
LAW OFFICES OF RONALD M. ANDERSON  
600 108TH AVENUE N.E., SUITE 507  
BELLEVUE, WA 98004

EXAMINER

ZHOU, TING

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2173

DATE MAILED: 08/05/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/882,985

Applicant(s)

MORTON ET AL.

Examiner

Ting Zhou

Art Unit

2173

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 June 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-42 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-42 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                        | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)    | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____  |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

PD

### DETAILED ACTION

1. The amendment filed on 10 June 2005 have been received and entered. Claims 1-42 as amended are pending in the application.

#### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 (e) that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office Action:

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1, 3-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ferguson et al. (US 2002/0065849 A1) hereinafter Ferguson.

As per claims 1 (method), Ferguson anticipated discloses a method for providing a Web view page in a dialog box of an application program, comprising the steps of:

(a) in the application program, providing a dialog box object that communicates with a browser module is taught by Ferguson as the technique of the productivity application 100 is launched along with the network enabling software 210, because of the appropriate configuration of the network enabling software 210, it automatically launches when the productivity application 100 is launch (see page 15, left col., paragraph [147] and upon such selection, a parameter information dialog box, such as displayed in Fig. 16E may be presented (see col. 20, right col., paragraph [204]); and

(b) displaying the Web view page in the dialog box of the application program is taught by Ferguson as the technique of the developer constructing embedded application web pages may find two or more page at a given web site (see page 20, left col., paragraph [199]).

This claim is therefore rejected for the reasons as set forth above.

As per claim 10, Ferguson anticipated discloses method for providing a Web view page in an application program dialog box, comprising the steps of:

(a) determining whether a computing resource supports a Web view page in the application program dialog box is taught by Ferguson as the technique of the augmented desktop application and enhanced document together form an Internet or network-enabled application that facilitates access to remote services and functionality while retaining functionality inherently provided by the desktop application (see page 5, right col., paragraph [055]); and if so,

(b) accessing a browser module with the application program, to enable browser functions from within the application dialog box is taught by Ferguson as the technique of the developer may also create parallel browser based views of these distributed documents. The choice of whether to download a browser based view or desktop application based view of a page may be controlled by preferences set by the user (see page 6, right col., paragraph [0064]).

This claim is therefore rejected for the reasons as set forth above.

As per claim 19, Ferguson anticipated discloses a method for accessing a computer file stored on a computing resource from an application program dialog box of an application program, comprising the steps of:

(a) opening the application program dialog box with the application program is taught by Ferguson as the technique of the user provided with a information source property dialog box (see page 21, left co., paragraph [212]);

(b) requesting a Web view page from the computing resource is taught by Ferguson as the technique of the augmented desktop application and enhanced document together form an Internet or network-enabled application that facilitates access to remote services and functionality while retaining functionality inherently provided by the desktop application (see page 5, right col., paragraph [055]); and

(c) displaying the Web view page within the application program dialog box is taught by Ferguson as the technique of the developer constructing embedded application web pages may find two or more page at a given web site (see page 20, left col., paragraph [199]).

This claim is therefore rejected for the reasons as set forth above.

As per claim 20, the limitation of requesting a Web view page comprises the step of sending a request to a URL address for a Web view page related to the URL and the application program is taught by Ferguson as the technique of the developer clicks on the "new Web page" button, the system presents to the developer a wizard containing a palette that displays a selection of templates for designing a web page. In addition, the wizard may include a "browser to web page" button (see page 18, left col., paragraph [183]).

This claim is therefore rejected for the reasons as set forth above.

As per claim 25, Ferguson anticipated discloses a method for initiating an application program function using a browser module accessible from within a dialog box of an application program, comprising the steps of:

(a) enabling a user to selectively activate display of a Web view page within the dialog box of the application program is taught by Ferguson as the technique of the developer constructing embedded application web pages may find two or more page at a given web site (see page 20, left col., paragraph [199]);

(b) enabling a user to select an element of the Web view page upon which an application program function is to be implemented, to initiate execution of said function is taught by Ferguson as the technique of the developer may also create parallel browser based views of these distributed documents. The choice of whether to download a browser based view or desktop application based view of a page may be controlled by preferences set by the user (see page 6, right col., paragraph [0064]); and

(c) executing the application program function with the application program is taught by Ferguson as the technique of the augmented desktop application and enhanced document together form an Internet or network-enabled application that facilitates access to remote services and functionality while retaining functionality inherently provided by the desktop application (see page 5, right col., paragraph [055]).

This claim is therefore rejected for the reason as set forth above.

As per claim 26, the limitations of accessing the browser module with the application program and displaying the Web view page within the dialog box with the browser module is

Art Unit: 2173

taught by Ferguson as the techniques of the developer may also create parallel browser based views of these distributed documents. The choice of whether to download a browser based view or desktop application based view of a page may be controlled by preferences set by the user (see page 6, right col., paragraph [0064]) and the developer constructing embedded application web pages may find two or more page at a given web site (see page 20, left col., paragraph [199]).

This claim is therefore rejected for the reasons as set forth above.

As per claim 31, due to the similarity of the first two limitations of this claim to the first two limitations of claim 25, except for the last limitation of executing the browser function with the browser module is taught by Ferguson as the technique of the developer may also create parallel browser based views of these distributed documents. The choice of whether to download a browser based view or desktop application based view of a page may be controlled by preferences set by the user (see page 6, right col., paragraph [0064]). This claim is therefore rejected for the reason as set forth above.

As per claim 32, due to the similarity of this claim to that of claim 26, this claim is therefore rejected for the same reasons applied to claim 26.

As per claim 35, Ferguson anticipated disclose machine readable medium storing machine instructions for selectively opening a dialog box in an application program as the technique of productivity application 100 is launched along with the network enabling software 210, because of the appropriate configuration of the network enabling software 210, it

Art Unit: 2173

automatically launches when the productivity application 100 is launch (see page 15, left col., paragraph [147], and upon such selection, a parameter information dialog box, such as displayed in Fig. 16E may be presented (see col. 20, right col., paragraph [204]); and displaying a Web view page within the dialog box of the application program to enable a user to selectively execute a function from within the dialog box by selecting an element on the Web view page is taught by Ferguson as the technique of the developer constructing embedded application web pages may find two or more page at a given web site (see page 20, left col., paragraph [199]).

This claim is therefore rejected for the reason as set forth above.

As per claim 36, Ferguson anticipated discloses a machine readable medium storing machine instructions for generating a Web view page for display within a dialog box of an application program in response to a request for opening the Web view page in the dialog box as the technique of a parameter information dialog box, such as displayed in Fig. 16E may be presented (see col. 20, right col., paragraph [204]) and the developer constructing embedded application web pages may find two or more page at a given web site (see page 20, left col., paragraph [199]).

This claim is therefore rejected for the reason as set forth above.

As per claim 37, due to the similarity of this claim to that of claim 19, except for system instead of method claim, this claim is therefore rejected for the same reasons applied against claim 19.

As per claim 3, the limitation of wherein the Web view page enables a user to selectively initiate an application program specific function is taught by Ferguson as the technique of the developer may also create parallel browser based views of these distributed documents. The choice of whether to download a browser based view or desktop application based view of a page may be controlled by preferences set by the user (see page 6, right col., paragraph [0064]). This claim is therefore rejected for the reason as set forth above.

As per claim 4, the limitation of executing a separate browser program to display content in response to the user selecting a browser specific function related to the content is taught by Ferguson as the technique of while certain development capability may be best to provided through a specific, **separate application program** for developer using the technology, many capabilities may be provided (see page 14, right col., paragraph [146]).

This claim is therefore rejected for the reasons as set forth above.

As per claim 5, the limitation of wherein selection of an application program specific function by a user causes a file management function to be performed is taught by Ferguson as the technique of while certain development capability may be best to provided through a **specific, separate application program** for developer using the technology, many capabilities may be provided to developers through an extended version of the target productivity application itself (see page 14, right col., paragraph [146]).

This claim is therefore rejected for the reason as set forth above.

As per claim 8, the limitation of enabling the user to define the Web view page using a hypertext markup language file is taught by Ferguson as the technique of the developer constructing embedded application Web pages may find that two or more pages at a given Web site (or all pages at a given site) are related and appropriate to be rendered as **embedded application web pages**. In this case, a word processing version of each of the two or more page may be created and stored within a single enhanced word processing document (see col. 20, left col., paragraph [0199]).

This claim is therefore rejected for the reason as set forth above.

As per claim 11, the limitation of verifying that the computing resource is able to generate a web view page of information usable in the application program dialog box is taught by Ferguson as the technique of **managing who has permission to modify a document** (see page 22, right col., paragraph [224]) and Enter Registration Information into Object (see block 420 in Fig. 4)

This claim is therefore rejected for the reason as set forth above.

As per claim 12, the limitation of confirming that the computing resource recognizes an application program function attribute in a request to the computing resource to generate a web view page is taught by Ferguson as the technique of Parameter Name Entered (see block 1720 in Fig. 17).

This claim is therefore rejected for the reason as set forth above.

As per claim 14, due to the similarity of this claim to the combination of limitation b of claim 1 and claim 3, this claim is therefore rejected for the reasons as set forth above.

As per claim 16, due to the similarity of this claim to that of claim 5, this claim is therefore rejected for the same reasons applied to claim 5.

As per claim 17, the limitation of determining that an element selected by the user corresponds to a function of the browser module is taught by Ferguson as the technique of while certain development capability may be best to provided through **a specific, separate application program** for developer using the technology, many capabilities may be provided to developers through **an extended version of the target productivity application itself** (see page 14, right col., paragraph [146]).

This claim is therefore rejected for the reasons as set forth above.

As per claim 21, due to the similarity of this claim to the combination of claim 1, limitation c and claim 4, this claim is therefore rejected for the reasons as set forth above.

As per claim 22, the limitations of enabling a user to access the computer file by selecting an element of the Web view page displayed within the application program dialog box and requesting access to the computer file from the computing resource, based on the element of the Web view page that was selected are taught by Ferguson as the technique of productivity application 100 is launched along with the network enabling software 210, because of the appropriate configuration of the network enabling software 210, it automatically launches when the productivity application 100 is launch (see page 15, left col., paragraph [147], and upon such

selection, a parameter information dialog box, such as displayed in Fig. 16E may be presented (see col. 20, right col., paragraph [204])

This claim is therefore rejected for the reason as set forth above.

As per claim 23, the limitation of initiating a function of the application program that affects the computer file based on the element of the Web view page that was selected is taught by Ferguson as the technique of the developer may also create parallel browser based views of these distributed documents. The choice of whether to download a browser based view or desktop application based view of a page may be controlled by preferences set by the user (see page 6, right col., paragraph [0064]).

This claim is therefore rejected for the reason as set forth above.

As per claim 24, the limitation of the function of the application program is opening the computer file in the application program is taught by Ferguson as the technique of while certain development capability may be best to provided through **a specific, separate application program** for developer using the technology, many capabilities may be provided to developers through **an extended version of the target productivity application itself** (see page 14, right col., paragraph [146]).

This claim is therefore rejected for the reason as set forth above.

As per claim 34, Ferguson discloses the limitation of filter elements of the web view page as the technique of provides the ability to cache, snapshot, or transmit entire web sites or portions

Art Unit: 2173

of web sites, and work within an entire web site while disconnected from the hosting network (see page 20, left col., paragraph [199]).

This claim is therefore rejected for the reasons as set forth above.

As per claim 38, due to the similarity of this claim to the combination of claims 1 and 3, except for system instead of method claim, this claim is therefore rejected for the reasons as set forth above.

As per claim 41, due to the similarity of this claim to the combination of claims 1 and 3, this claim is therefore rejected for the same reasons applied to claims 1 and 3.

As per claim 6, Ferguson discloses the limitations of detecting an element in the Web view page selected by a user and processing the element with the browser module if the element relates to a browser function as the technique of the developer may also create parallel browser based views of these distributed documents. The choice of whether to download a browser based view or desktop application based view of a page may be controlled by preferences set by the user (see page 6, right col., paragraph [0064]). This claim is therefore rejected for the reasons as set forth above.

As per claim 7, the limitation of displaying a web page in a separate browser program as a function of the element selected by the user is taught by Ferguson as the technique of while certain development capability may be best to provided through a specific, **separate application**

**program** for developer using the technology, many capabilities may be provided (see page 14, right col., paragraph [146]). This claim is therefore rejected for the reasons as set forth above.

As per claim 13, Ferguson discloses the limitation of loading the browser module into a memory space reserved to the application program as the technique of the word processing document is used with the productivity application augmented with network-functionality software that is resided in computer memory (see page 2, right col., paragraph [014]). This claim is therefore rejected for the reasons as set forth above.

As per claim 15, due to the similarity of this claim to that of claim 6, this claim is therefore rejected for the reasons applied to claim 6.

As per claim 18, due to the similarity of this claim to that of claim 7, this claim is therefore rejected for the reasons applied to claim 7.

As per claim 27, Ferguson discloses the limitations of employing the browser module to detect that the user selected an element of the Web view page and the browser module determining that the browser module need not initiate a browser function related to the element that was selected as the technique of the developer may also create parallel browser based views of these distributed documents. The choice of whether to download a browser based view or desktop application based view of a page may be controlled by preferences set by the user. The developer may also wish to augment the browser-based version of the page so that it provides

Art Unit: 2173

some of the additional functionality included in the productivity application based version.

Examples of such network functionality may include scripting for form data posting, HTML based light weight grid handling, and inserting meta tags into the browser based view of a page for managing later wire frame synchronization with the desktop application version (see page 6, right col., paragraph [0064]). This claim is therefore rejected for the reasons as set forth above.

As per claim 33, due to the similarity of this claim to the limitations a and b of claim 27, this claim is therefore rejected for the reasons as set forth above.

As per claim 28, Ferguson discloses the limitation of the browser module communicates information about the element that was selected to the application program as the technique of the developer may also wish **to augment the browser-based version of the page so that it provides some of the additional functionality included in the productivity application based version**. Examples of such network functionality may include scripting for form data posting, HTML based light weight grid handling, and inserting meta tags into the browser based view of a page for managing later wire frame synchronization with the desktop application version (see page 6, right col., paragraph [0064]). This claim is therefore rejected for the reasons as set forth above.

As per claim 29, the limitation of wherein the application program obtains information about the element that was selected from an operating system under which the application program is running is taught by Ferguson as the technique of code for coupling at least one network enabling object to word processing document, wherein said at least one network

Art Unit: 2173

enabling object is configured to provide network based functionality to said word processing document (see page 23, left col., first paragraph). This claim is therefore rejected for the reason as set forth above.

As per claim 30, due to the similarity of this claim to that of claim 6, this claim is therefore rejected for the same reasons applied to claim 6.

As per claim 39, Ferguson discloses the limitations of determine whether a remote computing resource supports a Web view page in the application program dialog box; and if so access machine instructions stored in the memory that execute a browser module, to enable browser functions from within the application dialog box as the techniques of the augmented desktop application and enhanced document together form an Internet or network-enabled application that facilitates access to remote services and functionality while retaining functionality inherently provided by the desktop application (see page 5, right col., paragraph [055]), the word processing document is used with the productivity application augmented with network-functionality software that is resided in computer memory (see page 2, right col., paragraph [014]), and the developer may also create parallel browser based views of these distributed documents. The choice of whether to download a browser based view or desktop application based view of a page may be controlled by preferences set by the user (see page 6, right col., paragraph [0064]).

This claim is therefore rejected for the reasons as set forth above.

Art Unit: 2173

As per claim 40, Ferguson discloses the limitation of defining the Web view page is obtained from the remote computing device and stored in the memory as the technique of the developer constructing embedded application Web pages may find that two or more pages at a given Web site (or all pages at a given site) are related and appropriate to be rendered as embedded application web pages. In this case, a word processing version of each of the two or more page may be created and stored within a single enhanced word processing document (see col. 20, left col., paragraph [0199]).

This claim is therefore rejected for the reasons as set forth above.

As per claim 42, due to the similarity of this claim to that of claim 1 and 6, this claim is therefore rejected for the same reasons applied to claims 1 and 6.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103.***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office Action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained through the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Ferguson et al.

(US 2002/0065849 A1 hereinafter Ferguson in view of Mathieu et al. (USPN: 6,009,441)

hereinafter Mathieu.

As per claim 2, Ferguson discloses the invention substantially as claimed above.

Ferguson, however, does not disclose the limitations enabling a user to select a desired format from among the plurality of formats for displaying the dialog box; and in response thereto, displaying the dialog box of the application program in the desired format selected by the user.

Mathieu discloses the limitations of enabling a user to select a desired format from among the plurality of formats for displaying the dialog box; and in response thereto, displaying the dialog box of the application program in the desired format selected by the user as the techniques of if the user inserts this WebBot component into a Web page using the FrontPage editor, a timestamp WebBot properties dialog box 130 is opened, as shown in Fig. 7 (see col. 7, lines 18-21) and a drop down list box 140 displays the current time in several different time and date formats from which the user can make a selection (see col. 7, lines 34-36 and see dialog date, time format 138, 140 in Fig. 7).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include Mathieu's teachings of enabling a user to select a desired format from among the plurality of formats for displaying the dialog box; and in response thereto, displaying the dialog box of the application program in the desired format selected by the user into that of Ferguson invention. By doing so, the system would be enhanced by providing web authoring tool to its end user wherein it allows user capable of selecting desired format for display dialog box based on user desired manner.

***Response to Arguments***

4. Applicant's arguments filed 10 June 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive:

5. With respect to claim 1, the applicant argues that Ferguson does not appear to teach or suggest displaying a Web view page and does not appear to teach or suggest a dialog box object that is provided from within the application program. The examiner respectfully disagrees.

Firstly, the applicant argues that a Web view page, defined in the specification as that which allows production of custom views and functions of a directory structure on a server without having to change the application program, is different than a Web page. Specifically, the applicant argues that Ferguson teaches that a *word processing document* enhanced with application web pages, is displayed in the applicant program, and not a Web view page. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is respectfully noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., a Web view page which allows production of custom views and functions of a directory structure on a server without having to change the application program) are not recited in the rejected claim(s).

Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). In other words, the Web view page, as defined in the specification of the invention is not explicitly claimed in the recited language of the claims. The claims simply recite, "displaying the Web view page in the dialog box of the application program", without reciting that a Web view page is a web page that allows production of custom views and functions of a directory structure on a server without having to change the application program. Ferguson teaches that

Art Unit: 2173

the display of a word processing document that is enhanced with application web pages, on page 2, paragraph 0013, and therefore, Ferguson teaches the display of application web pages, i.e. web view pages.

Furthermore, the applicant argues that Ferguson does not disclose or suggest that the word processing document is displayed in or even includes a dialog box. The examiner respectfully disagrees. On pages 20-21, paragraphs 0200-0216, Ferguson teaches that a dialog box wizard such as those shown in Figures 16C-16D, are displayed; the dialog box wizards can be used to select and preview network-based content, i.e. web pages. Therefore, Ferguson teaches that the productivity application displays dialog boxes, i.e. wizards, which communicate with a browser module, i.e. select network-based content, and display web pages in the dialog box, i.e. preview the selected networked based content in the dialog box wizard.

In view of the above, the examiner respectfully asserts that Ferguson teaches the limitations of claim 1, as presently recited.

6. With respect to claims 10, 19, 25, 31, 35, 36, 37, the applicant argues that since these independent claims include references to Web view pages, for similar reasons to claim 1, Ferguson does not teach the claims. In view of the examiner's response to arguments regarding claim 1, the examiner respectfully asserts that Ferguson teaches the subject claims.

7. With respect to claim 2, the applicant argues that claim 2 depends from independent claim 1, and should be patentable for the same reasons. In view of the examiner's response to

Art Unit: 2173

arguments regarding claim 1, the examiner respectfully asserts that the combination of Ferguson and Mathieu teach the subject claim.

8. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

#### *Conclusion*

In responding to this office action, please note that the examiner of record for the above-identified application has changed. Please direct all future correspondence to the examiner listed below.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ting Zhou whose telephone number is (571) 272-4058. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 7:00 am - 4:30 pm.

Art Unit: 2173

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Cabeca can be reached at (571) 272-4048. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

TZ



JOHN CABECA  
SUPERVISOR, PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100